

Earle Havens

©March 2014. All rights reserved.

The Hidden Renaissance Planning Meeting: Summary Notes and Transcript

Summary Explanation of this Publication

In August 2014, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation awarded the Sheridan Libraries of Johns Hopkins University a \$39,000 Planning Grant to explore the creation of a pilot digital humanities project dealing with heavily annotated early modern imprints. The grant funds were used to underwrite the cost of a three-day planning workshop convened at Johns Hopkins University in late August 2014, followed by the participating institutions' intention to complete a full implementation grant request to fund the creation of a digital resource geared to on-line research of early modern annotated books). This project was the result of an international scholarly collaboration between the Department of Special Collections and the Digital Research and Curation Center of the Sheridan Libraries at Johns Hopkins University (JHU); the Princeton University Library; and the Centre for Editing Lives & Letters at University College London (CELL, UCL). The Principal Investigator for this grant was Dr. Earle A. Havens of the Sheridan Libraries at JHU. The Co-Principal Investigators for this project were Professor Lisa Jardine of CELL, UCL; Professor Anthony Grafton of Princeton University; and Professor Walter Stephens of JHU. What follows is a list of participants in that planning workshop, and summaries and detailed transcripts of the discussions that transpired during the course of the three-day workshop.

List of Participants:

Marc Caball (University College Dublin, Humanities Institute)

Sayed Choudhury (Johns Hopkins University, Sheridan Libraries, Digital Research and Curation Center)

Stephen Ferguson (Princeton University Library, Department of Rare Books and Manuscripts)

Anthony Grafton (Princeton University, Department of History, **Co-PI**)

Earle Havens (Johns Hopkins University, Sheridan Libraries, Special Collections; Department of History; Singleton Center for the Study of Premodern Europe, **PI**)

Steven van Impe (Erfgoedbibliotheek Hendrik Conscience, Antwerp; Davidsfonds Universiteit Vrije Tijd)

Lisa Jardine (University College London, Renaissance Studies; Director, Centre for

Interdisciplinary Research in Humanities; Centre for Editing Lives & Letters, **Co-PI**)

Elizabeth Mengel (Johns Hopkins University, Sheridan Libraries, Associate Director Scholarly Resources and Special Collections)

Johan Oosterman (Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, Medieval and Early Modern Literature/History of the Book)

Andrew Pettegree (University of St. Andrews, School of History; Director, Universal Short-Title Catalogue)

Paul Saenger (Newberry Library, Chicago)

William Sherman (University of York, Department of English Literature; Director, Centre for Renaissance and Early Modern Studies)

Walter Stephens (Johns Hopkins University, Department of German and Romance Languages and Literatures; Singleton Center for the Study of Premodern Europe, **Co-PI**)

Matthew Symonds (University College London, Centre for Editing Lives & Letters)

Winston Tabb (Johns Hopkins University, Sheridan Dean of Libraries and University Museums)

Karin Trainer (Princeton University Libraries, University Librarian)

Arnoud Visser (University of Utrecht, Department Dutch Studies; Research Institute for History and Culture-Textual Culture)

Neil Weijer (Johns Hopkins University, PhD Candidate, Department of History), scribe for workshop

8/29: Informal Discussion and Exhibition: George Peabody Library, 4:00-6:00 PM

Summary of Major Discussion Points

- Suggested goals for the project include a technological platform as well as a system of cataloguing that will be useful for the study of annotations and easy to implement in other library collections.
- This project should remain modest in scope, carefully limited, with intensive content, leading to a model that is exportable through use and outreach. The project must differentiate itself from a straightforward supply of digital surrogates of select materials.

Thoughts & Goals: Initial comments on what the project should and can do

Anthony Grafton: The project should use technology to present annotation in a way that synthesizes with traditional cataloguing.

Earle Havens: Wider applications beyond academic research—pedagogical applications, providing access for other educational and research institutions lacking extensive rare book collections, particularly those enriched with historic readerly annotation/engagement.

Paul Saenger: One outcome could be alerting people about this material in context of their own untapped and not sufficiently catalogued sources: provincial seminary libraries, smaller historical societies, public library collections, etc. Little of this information is available via Worldcat, Union Catalogues, etc.

Anthony Grafton: Another outcome would be to provide evidence of continued importance of rare books, their particular individuality beyond the level of the printed text.

Earle Havens: A possible outcome would be a standardized vocabulary for cataloguing manuscript annotations (either minimal vis-à-vis provenance and “light” annotation, or deeply annotated books: these standards do not currently exist.

Lisa Jardine: Should this matter of cataloguing be a protocol, rather than an essential part of our envisioned project?

Andrew Pettegree: How big would such a grant need to be, and how will the proposal for a larger grant relate to this planning grant?

Lisa Jardine: Need to define the relative status of each participant in terms of grant funds, how to incorporate individuals/opportunities for collaboration into the grant?

[The conversation then turned to a display and discussion of some of JHU’s most heavily annotated books]

August 30th, 2013

Business Meeting I: BLC, Richard Macksey Seminar Room, 9:00AM-12:00PM

Summary Discussion Points:

- The project presents an important opportunity for scholarship in the study of early books and annotations, even though the material for the study is, due to previous preferences for splitting collections and washing books, scattered, isolated, and often incomplete and decontextualized.

- The project would be suited to use existing technology wherever possible, but must not be completely technology-driven, or forced into an existing interactive platform. The Shared Canvas system used for the Roman de la Rose project could be adapted to support imprints as well as manuscripts, and its functions and use cases should be as expansive as possible, within reason, as annotated books are complex, dynamic, and diverse composites of print and manuscript.
- Access is a key concern of the project. Numerous types of marginalia (textual, pictorial, claiming ownership, &c.) might each count quite differently as forms of “interpretation.” Without clarity in cataloguing, the system will be too cumbersome to be adaptable or used by non-specialists. Without use by the wider scholarly community (extendable to almost any related humanities project), and those beyond the scholarly community but interested in historical material, the database will not grow beyond its limited envisioned scope and purpose.
- User data and statistics from other digital projects (Annotated Books Online, Roman de la Rose, &c.) should inform this project. Core groups of users (scholars, educators, and non-specialist enthusiasts) rely on such projects for specific content. However, there are also challenges that the project must overcome: Full transcriptions or translations are time consuming and labor intensive. Also, humanities scholars are often unaccustomed to sharing their work in an open format prior to a traditional form of “publication” with respect to the results of their research. Resource requirements for database maintenance and modification become larger as the number of users grow.
- The open-source nature of Shared Canvas, and the development of project-specific “tools” for research allow for the present development of a research tool, but by no means a novel “world view.”
- The group was quite adamant that the usefulness of the tools and digital content must extend beyond a specialist group of scholars working on the material. It should not be tailored exclusively to one discrete scholarly project or line of interpretation. It must enable/invite a wider and indeed a new community of practitioners of this type of scholarship, augmenting the enterprise with their own findings and conclusions.

Meeting Notes:

Winston Tabb: Welcome and review of planning grant goals. We will need here to be result oriented. JHU’s involvement and experience with Digital Humanities grows out of the Digital Roman de la Rose project, but new technological developments present new and greater opportunities. What do scholars want to have happen? How do your scholarly requirements fit in with the technical requirements to make such a digital initiative work?

[Introductions around the table]

Earle Havens: How can we contextualize the project within the history of reading practices?

Lisa Jardine: Conventional print materials and scholarly methodologies cannot cope with marginalia studies—for example her Gabriel Harvey marginalia project and the relationships between marginalia within books. Annotation is far more interactive and dynamic than dealing with a simply historical text. Digital technology is really only now catching up to our aspiration for a history of reading that engages on this higher level, long after the earliest inspiration behind “book history” dating from the 1980s. It is time now to invest expertise in technology and its further development in humanities scholarship, but experts also need to frame the question in representative, complex, and sophisticated ways that reflect the complexity and sophistication of these most complex composite texts that are early annotated books. We need to anticipate needs and desires for technological function to continue to be relevant, but not simply respond to technological development as the driver in and of itself.

Anthony Grafton: Marginalia studies have grown from a “side study” to a lively area of scholarly historical inquiry. Methodological overlap between disciplines is an inherent aspect of this field, and that, too, should attract new scholars, and new scholarship. A few basic questions:

- 1) How do we find a way to make basic information about this class of research material to younger starters in the field, beyond standard library access in the catalogue?
- 2) How do collections currently support this research? Can they if treated in conventional ways alone? With few exceptions, librarians are not interested in marginal notations, and catalogues fall far behind actual scholarly interest, the priorities of library access and scholarly access are not fully aligned. Surely new discoveries and contributions to existing projects must lie “hidden” in libraries all around the world. This project has the potential to serve as a model for cataloguing as well as scholarly research—a new set of protocols to interpret, described, and more fully catalogue and access the large variety in contemporary annotation, as well as a range of cataloguing procedures broad enough to account for all the myriad things that can qualify as “marginalia.”
- 3) How do we present annotated books on-line in a format that adds value to their digital presentation, both visually and in terms of allied forms of access-driven metadata. An initial experimental project with Gabriel Harvey’s annotated Livy attempted linking translations and transliterations to useful interpretive notes. Even so, there is more to be done with just the one book. This project could continue work on Harvey’s other richly annotated books and add in similar materials. Cataloguing must provide others the ability to see what we can’t currently see, not just supporting what we do now. Don’t want to be Melville Marginalia—a project that really could not keep up with its original ambitions.
- 4) Finding aids must make materials available in this “hidden Renaissance.” In editing these texts as well as making them accessible through transcription and translation, we can focus on the “erudite” Renaissance book not because it would be hands down the most interesting thing we could do, but because it dramatically expands our current access and expertise.

Earle Havens: There are also other practical considerations: access to books must accompany scholarly engagement by both the developers of digital humanities projects, and subsequently by

researchers. Discovering and building collections is a challenge. “Collections” of annotated books are nearly all accidental in nature, despite the attempts of some to create coherent collections of them (for example, the Bernard Rosenthal collection at the Beinecke Library at Yale). Owing to the relative scarcity of these materials in the marketplace for acquisition, and the overwhelming condition of “undercataloguing” of existing collections, these “collections” tend to be representative of only a part of the larger realm of reading practices recorded in manuscript in early imprints (the Rosenthal Collection is endowed with many of the ubiquitous editions of the ancient works of Cicero, but remarkably fewer that were written by the equally ubiquitous Renaissance humanist, Desiderius Erasmus).

The legibility of annotations, often informed by the given intent of a given annotator (some may have thought of others reading their notes, others with sloppy notes suggestive of no such intention). There are aspects of marginalia that cannot be captured: they reflect the private, candid, and personal aspect of Renaissance reading. John Adams’ library produced similar revelations, with his copious notes from the 18th century. How does this relate to the established canon of acknowledged historical authors? Not just Gabriel Harvey, but the far more common phenomenon of anonymous annotation? Minor figures have interactions with texts, many of them quite sophisticated. That said, possessing the clear context of the annotator’s identity and precise position in the historical past, offers far more contextual insight into the phenomenon of that particular person’s readerly agenda, influences, priorities, experiences, etc. We might want to restrict our project to the riches examples of deeply and richly annotated books by influential and learned authors as a useful starting point for this project, inviting others to tackle the vast permutations of less “interpretable” and “contextually specific” annotated books.

Lisa Jardine: Counterpoint: any of these books can show the hand of the writer at work. However, interest in marginalia is comparatively recent; previously, books with annotations were quite commonly washed, their margins trimmed, &c., precisely because of commercial value concerns among a small elite of wealthy antiquarian book collectors, even in some cases institutional/academic rare book libraries. Any study of these materials will, of necessity, be incomplete. Randomness, broad vs. specific reader interactions, &c. Harvey, by contrast, presents a reasonable sample size of very specific, learned, interpretive annotations within a specific historical period around similar materials—humanistic (i.e., ancient Greco-Roman, later historical texts, contemporary political works, legal, and theological).

Also, there are other types of marginalia that are constructed for others, not necessarily by the original author of the printed text: printed marginalia, other interpretive apparatus in printed books and manuscripts: illustrations, maps, organizational systems, indexes, &c. Some marginalia are quite impersonal, even simply summary, others filled with cross references to other works, others that are deeply polemical.

Anthony Grafton: Another type of annotation is that done by “scholarly entrepreneurs,” people like Archbishop Parker who possessed teams of scholars annotating their works, secretaries, etc. Also, will this project extend to texts in manuscript that are subsequently annotated in manuscript, or just hand annotated printed books? At this initial stage, working with annotated printed books would seem to be more manageable and still able to possess scholarly integrity and usefulness.

Earle Havens: That may be a practical consideration. We could, at the same time, consider introducing more variety across many classes, types, and degrees of annotation across lots of different textual genres, attempt to provide a more representative picture of early modern book culture, including manuscript texts with manuscript notes. It should be added on that latter point that entirely manuscript texts present a problem in terms of differentiating scribal contributions and interventions from readerly ones.

Lisa Jardine: Starting after the period incunabula could be another useful approach, as the field of book history is far more established with respect to materials dating from the sixteenth-century onwards. I would suggest that we narrow expectations, so that we also have time and resources to create their interactive visualizations and inputs that will be essential to users.

Marc Caball: What about audience? Will there be within this project a valuable opportunity to create new audiences?

Lisa Jardine: CELL has never restricted itself exclusively to scholarly audiences. We provide useful overlays of texts, as well as translations and transcriptions so that people can look at translations against the texts in their original languages. Provide tools for general access, and our experience is that people will use those tools. Retired people with leisure time, especially, may contribute their time and interest to this project.

Anthony Grafton: It is simply a fact that classical texts and canonical ones invariably need translations to assure the greatest degrees of public access. Cataloguing of annotated books should be a bit more expansive—sample digital pictures of annotations could be usefully included as well. I would argue, too, for the inclusion of historical manuscripts bearing additional manuscript annotations. Looking at various sorts of school texts scribally produced from printed books show that certain phenomena arise that are specific to a purely manuscript tradition. Not including them risks the presumption that every printed book is a “new” medium, rather than properly illustrating their linkages to an allied manuscript tradition well into the era of print.

Lisa Jardine: A question for Arnoud Visser: How long did it take to translate marginalia for Annotated Books Online, just to get an idea?

Arnoud Visser: Several months even for just one book, with the assistance of multiple contributors. Providing full transcription and translation will necessarily lead to your cutting down on the total number of books that actually get included. You can use an ongoing “Wiki” model for aspects of this work. The entire book/notes may not be edited, but as people use them and value them, that work may continue with contributions from the public.

Andrew Pettegree: We need a way to articulate the methodology behind this project, and make it appealing to others. How do you decide which annotations are important, and then how do you convey this to other people?

Lisa Jardine: Must be open source, providing an exemplary research models, something that

provides very generous, intuitive access.

Earle Havens: One practical methodological decision about annotations could be to focus on from the start at a limited number of related early annotated books whose manuscript annotations are actively and consistently interpretive of the original text, revealing an intellectual as well as a material engagement with texts and intertextuality.

Stephen Ferguson: Will the content developed in this way be added to traditional rare books catalogue records as well? Does the exclusion of certain kinds of annotation prevent a partial or even mixed up view of a book? A cataloguing model, versus a digital surrogate-based model, would not be as sophisticated as these online texts, but more potentially useful in a broad, conventional sense.

Anthony Grafton: Sometimes these books provide keys to the active interpretation by their author, but these are few.

Lisa Jardine: We should not focus only on a solitary annotation, even though that can constitute most of the notes in a given book. Shared practices are most vivid where they are extensive.

William Sherman: Room for new forms of interpretation can mean recording marks without affecting their meaning. The current charge of new technology is less interactive than the reader interactions that we are thinking of recording. Sharing marginalia as tools for interaction may also introduce a transgressive element.

Paul Saenger: What about different copies of the same book? Could these annotations be made to line up for comparison? I do not think that digitization is a substitute for acquisition, too. We need to encourage libraries to keep acquiring, especially when this can help show substantive variations between annotated copies.

Earle Havens: Specific priorities within humanistic scholarship used to inform cataloguing before the advent of library science (now not really even “library science” by “information science” even further removed from the perspective of the humanistic researcher). With the rise of library science and cataloguing in the middle of the 20th century, input from practicing humanist scholars fell away (the Library Committee of the American Historical Society was formed close to AHA’s inception in the last 19th century). The relative poverty of cataloguing information and standards to record manuscript annotation in books reflects this, with the complete absence of representative, controlled vocabularies, etc. Hopefully our developments might help reverse engineer this trend and enrich conventional cataloguing in the near future.

Marc Caball: What about annotators who do not fall under the traditional category of the “great reader” or the “great mind?” Less canonical sorts of annotators are different, but the scholarly potential behind working with their materials may challenge conventional priorities and perceived hierarchies.

Walter Stephens: Should hand-expurgation in printed books be considered a form of annotation? Censorship linked to different versions of the Catholic *Index of Prohibited Books* is hardly

uncommon. Also, what about books required to be censored by are not? Is un-censorship a consideration as well?

Lisa Jardine: I don't think that these points present us with an impossible task if our core activity is based on a concentrated selection of related texts that are work in progress. This would enable the inclusion of exempla of different texts. Creating an on-line digital gallery, even a blog, might allow us to build up data on the actual audience for texts. Some kind of user feedback system to track interest within the library/database could be essential to the development of the resource and answer some of these questions for us. Also, with respect to the interpretation of marks left by scholarly readers—traditional librarian cataloguers rarely possess the resources, background, and expertise of an early modern annotator, even at the physical level of paleography, Latin, etc. Low barriers to traditional forms of cataloguing these materials may be essential to making them more accessible.

Johan Oosterman: Extraction of the kind of information and material we are talking about could be done effectively at a more junior level by university students. With a clear understanding of this kind of cataloguing and database management, they can help libraries provide interpretive more material for scholars in terms of creating access.

Anthony Grafton: There seem to be two different levels of work here: (1) inventorying and cataloguing these materials from the larger mass of books in our libraries; and (2) our scholarly investment in deep scholarship (transcription, translation, commentary) on a limited number of books in the creation of the gallery, blog, &c.

Paul Saenger: Microfilm was a new technology when it came out, but is an inherently “closed” and unwieldy medium. Greater integration into online cataloguing needs to happen, because even with microfilm production lots of useful data was lost. This would broaden access and appreciation for books that we have.

Session 2: Presentations

1. Sayeed Choudhury: Technology Considerations, the Roman de la Rose Digital Library

Planning considerations:

What technology would support this structure and content, rather than take over the project?

The software development process involves key elements divorced from programming, which addresses specific needs. It is modular, changeable, and has architectural aspects that need to be understood.

Data modeling needs to begin at a basic level. What are the relationships, structural and semantic, that allow software developers to understand the data they are working with?

What type of content are we talking about? Any data model must be expandable, and extensive. A model that can bend, but not break.

“Agile software development” entails a break from working with a long sequence to working with small chunks of tasks identified over regular meetings with end users (“product owners”) to gather feedback on the system. This significantly prevents wasted time, effort, and resources.

4 layers to software development:

1. *Needs*: (some of these were discussed in our first session) What scholarly questions are we trying to answer
2. *Use cases*: a mixture scholarly & technological needs. **See Appendix below for handout distributed to participants.**
3. *Requirements*: The are functional (higher level/abstract) & technical (actual operational framework)
4. *Stories*: Short narratives that provide manageable action items to govern a short span (say, 2 weeks) of software development work punctuated by discussions and meetings with the users.

These phases are measurable. Relative velocity allows us to figure out how the project is progressing.

Early phases show considerable investment in building up the “scaffolding.” In this stage there is less to show initially, but results follow once groundwork is laid. There should also be a separation of concern, such that content and presentation will not overwhelm te user. Too close a tie between content and functionality requires more modification (in what ways is a MS different from a book). Presentation layer should have a decoupling of functions.

An essential question for a software developer to ask is “Do you need new software?” If seemingly compatible technology already exists, can it be modified or adapted to suit our purpose?

An essential component of any project proposal will be a software review, similar to a professional or scholarly literature review. Scholarly and community-based software platforms already exist in the open source world. Shared Canvas is an option, Roman de Rose incorporates it, we have experience working with it. We are currently implementing a structure around established standards & protocols.

Demonstration of the Shared Canvas platform via the Roman de la Rose Digital Library

Shared Canvas is a data model built with manuscript material in mind, but not exclusively manuscripts. It accepts “profiles” over a very basic data model. British Library and Bibliothèque Nationale are behind Shared Canvas. The possibility of a large corpus of digitized manuscript materials is available, with a community there to develop tools to manipulate the material in different ways. Tools are available once they are developed.

The JHU Roman de la Rose Digital Library viewer currently allows for independent manipulation of manuscripts and their content. Also allows overlays of other materials (i.e., annotation) onto the visual “canvas.”

Thinking of collections as “(Big) Data.” There is a simple definition behind this: Data is “big” at the moment it overwhelms your community of users. Methods and size/volume: if one data set does not present a clear method, it is, by definition, a big data set.

Roman de la Rose Digital Library content was put into a new scholarly framework—a new organization scheme by scene—that allows searching and matching of the entire content. This allows for the integration of mathematical concepts of organization, of thinking of your research materials as a “data set” rather than as a complex, physical collection of books.

The Roman de la Rose Digital Library encountered unexpected forms of interest in the collection. Openness begets community engagement.

Sustainability: Will people miss the Roman de la Rose Digital Library when it is gone? At this point, the answer is definitely “yes.” This is our long-standing experience, but we also have confidence that the model can also be adapted to fit new sorts of tools. This digital project is just that, a distinct project, not a “world view.”

Scientists and engineers very much care about consideration of space, time, and names. Do humanists?

Questions for Sayeed:

Lisa Jardine: Shared Canvas, how do the components fit together? How far can other components be added on?

Stephen Ferguson: How does the transcriptions/annotations coordinate with the visual base layer?

Arnoud Visser: We initially assumed for our project that everything might need to be transcribed, but user fatigue set in after a point. Full transcriptions are not always needed.

Sayeed Choudhury: A system was developed resulting in improvements, but was still

problematic.

Marc Caball: What is the point of these transcriptions? I am thinking of effort versus utility.

Sayeed Choudhury: We facilitate text-based searches, but also improve “touch and feel” and navigation. It basically just evolved from the initial vision of project. Segmentation was done by computer algorithm.

Earle Havens: What about floating transcription versus an overlay function? The overlay makes it hard to see the original text of the book below.

Lisa Jardine: Can Shared Canvas show different orientations of marginalia? Leiden has a system for that.

Sayeed Choudhury: Similar tools are being used with Shared Canvas and Alexandra Gillespie “Parker’s Scribes” project, they exist but are not yet readily compatible. Tools are able to be written and modified, a common thread in all of these developments in these projects. There is also the visual versus a more statistical experience in interfacing with the platform. A proposed outcome after the planning grant: we could do a mock-up of the larger project using Shared Canvas and available data.

2. Arnoud Visser: Annotated Books Online, a spin-off of the Gabriel Harvey Livy Project

Overview: We use a platform designed to facilitate collaboration among historians of reading. Software development was performed by Information Technology students at our university. Any user can contribute new material, or enrich existing material with transcriptions and translations. We launched in 2012, and now have available nearly 50 books from eight collections, with 80 registered users. This includes a small Gabriel Harvey annotated book collection collection, Philip Melancthon’s annotated edition of Homer. We are also hoping to include Martin Luther’s Bible.

Challenges we faced: Scholars resist collaboration (“sharing”), due to initial resistance to enter their own original material to Annotated Books Online. Libraries with annotated book holdings are more or less cooperative, though some worry about hosting their images externally, by another party. Interactivity is the most challenging part, of our 80 users, only 10 are especially active. Registration presents a very low barrier to encourage use.

Stephen Ferguson: Looking at different platforms, ways of structuring content can require translation, not reconversion. There is a need for coding and describing content differently.

Lisa Jardine: This sort of thing often happens with accretive projects, not necessarily focused site like the one we’re envisioning. Speed of addition not a selling point.

Arnoud Visser: The alliance between our participating institutions is meant to bring together a range of interested scholars around a specific platform.

Johan Oosterman: Does Annotated Books Online have guidelines to transcription/translation?

Arnoud Visser: These are determined by the particular format of the book.

Lisa Jardine: There are a number of transcription projects out there, but how do we differentiate, and how do we portray ourselves as a good example for the rest of them? Clearly transcription and translation of annotated makes these materials more accessible.

3. William Sherman: The Parker's Scribes Project

“Parker on the Web” was a multi-year project between Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, the Cambridge University Library, and Stanford University Libraries to digitize 538 manuscripts in the Archbishop Matthew Parker Library at Corpus Christi College, with medieval manuscripts forming a subset. This was made available as a proprietary (i.e., not open access) web-based application through subscription by libraries and universities a short while ago. The project was funded through the Mellon Foundation. [Editorial note: See at <http://parkerweb.stanford.edu/parker/actions/page.do?forward=home>]

Under the direction of Alexandra Gillespie (who was invited to our “Hidden Renaissance” planning meeting, but was ultimately unable to attend) from the University of Toronto, a new project called “Parker’s Scribes” uses Parker Library on the Web to index the scribal notes left by Archbishop Matthew Parker and his team of Elizabethan scholars, secretaries, &c., who built and used the Parker Library. The project will create individual scribal profiles, listing marks in Elizabethan hands in Parker’s books, identify the particular annotators, describe and study the nature of their work and collaboration with and for Parker, and link them to other early source texts. The purpose is to understand the role of this library in the larger Elizabethan Settlement, new ideas of English Protestant nationhood, and study how medieval books were used in later periods. The purpose is really about “identification” versus a heavy content-oriented interpretive approach.

Parker might be thought of as the “Hidden Middle Ages” what we want to do for the Hidden Renaissance project. There is something of an archival bias, reflecting Parker’s own bias and agenda, much as our own project would naturally determine some kind of bias or approach based on later annotated books.

In terms of the relation of the physical object to digital artifact, digitizing marginalia in printed books involves a potential bias because printed books in digital are all the same, but with each annotated book, the manuscripts are always different, unique. Printed books may be thought of as radically different from entirely manuscript books, due to evolutions of a given text, its edition, augmentation, and transformation over time. [Editorial note: See more at: <http://theparkerlibrary.wordpress.com/2012/11/23/parkers-scribes/>]

Earle Havens: A major purpose behind Parker’s enterprise, the fashioning of a Protestant ecclesiastical polemic through the reinterpretation of earlier, medieval manuscripts, makes the

purpose and particular activities of Parker's Scribes rather idiosyncratic, as Bill says, more "archival" and less a thoroughgoing content-based engagement with the reader's own engagement with the various elements of a given, limited set of printed works.

Anthony Grafton: There is a similar mode of argument at work in other writing. Focusing on Parker's Scribes alone causes that project to miss things like the influence of Lutheran church history from Matthias Flacius, similar historiographical models like Ceasar Baronius, &c. It's really a national/British project versus a Latin text-based one. It's treated more like the Cairo Geniza, a virtual archive connecting multiple different texts across spaces.

Earle Havens: I might also mention another project ongoing through Marie-Claire Beaulieu at Tufts University. They are involved with another digital transcription supported through the Perseus Project, allowing users to transcribe ancient texts directly from high-resolution digital images of ancient epigraphic inscriptions, and mapping transcription onto lettering. It is difficult for me to see how something like this might be used for extremely variable manuscript paleography in books, across multiple languages, with often extreme variations across and even within specific linguistic/geographical regions of Europe, including ligatures, symbols, etc. We could learn from how this project might crowd-source web-based open access contributions by non-project users. [Editorial note: See more at <http://sites.tufts.edu/perseusupdates/2013/01/02/marie-claire-beaulieu-named-associate-editor-of-the-perseus-digital-library/>]

Andrew Pettegree: By "registered users" does that mean that they enjoy unlimited access to the resource?

Arnoud Visser: There would have to be a supervisory archival system in place to restore older data should a user abuse their editing privileges. Making a bigger resource with greater access involves trust and monitoring that can easily become unmanageable.

Lisa Jardine: Regarding CELL's on-line Hooke Folio project, when it was down, people quickly noticed that and wrote to us that they really needed it back! There was, in other words, use without knowledge of use. [Editor's note: The Hooke Folio project juxtaposes original images alongside electronic transcriptions of a once lost manuscript of Robert Hooke papers, which I helped to recover, and which shows in remarkable detail the everyday work of early science. The transcriptions have been encoded according to CELL's standard for manuscript transcription matched with transcription software. There is an on-line interface. [Editorial Note: See <http://www.livesandletters.ac.uk/cell/Hooke/Hooke.html>]

Earle Havens: Are usage statistics for Annotated Books On-Line archived?

Arnoud Visser: The administrator of the site can observe movements and changes, but really at early stages. Our goal is to allow users to see latest activity performed around a given annotated book.

Matthew Symonds: In the logging functionality at CELL, users and hits are built in, Google Analytics is used to get a slightly bigger picture of traffic patterns, with the reporting based on

that. The source code is hosted through Github, which has tracking mechanisms available for the code's uses, downloads, and modifications.

Business Meeting III: BLC, Richard Macksey Seminar Room, 2:15-5:15PM Scholarly Purposes and Desired Outcomes

Summary of Major Discussion Points

- The prime focus of this project, from a collections perspective, would focus on a collection of about a dozen early modern imprints annotated by Gabriel Harvey and a selection of his contemporaries utilizing comparable materials (historical, theological, political, ancient and contemporary, geography, etc.), including heavily annotated books by sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century scholars, including Richard Eden and Isaac Casaubon, undertaken primarily out of the rare book collections of Princeton, Johns Hopkins, and UCL. These are figures whose annotated books the Principal Investigators have all worked with closely in the past.
- Harvey's marginalia are so expansive that they provide an ideal, initial "superset" of data which can also guide and inform the contextualization, and discovery of incomplete information concerning the reading practices of comparable scholars and active, interpretive annotators of the same period. Other figures are necessary to make the project methodologically viable and direct the project to opportunities for expansion and diversification.
- The extent to which the Project will expand into other active annotators, or other copies of annotated books outside this core focus is still a matter to be determined, and will likely depend on what other materials are found during the preparation for a final implementation grant and research at each respective repository. Other sources of funding may be available to undertake additional work of this kind, which can be added to the database, from within the participating universities.
- In order for the project to be sustainable, academically and otherwise, it needs to be adaptable enough for wider use beyond the Academy, and also be set up so that it may grow incrementally over time, informed by demonstrable patterns of use and interaction. We generally agree that this project may serve as a model for emulation, rather than a project which seeks to consume or otherwise supersede others.
- The project, as it is conceived, should promote scholarly involvement both across the communities of the host universities (incorporating undergraduate and graduate student researchers) and between the host universities (through the activities of the project PIs, and project postdoctoral fellows, Research Assistants, and contributing advisors).
- The value of the project lies in its contribution to the study and understanding of reading practices, in the form of engaged, interactive, and interpretive reading and annotating. It will have the ability to inject dynamism, difference, variety into the ways we currently

perceive and work with books as scholarly sources. This is especially true since the evidence of this, in the form of manuscript engagements with printed texts, currently lies outside the scope of what traditional library catalogues (even the best of them) can support in any comparable way, and, furthermore, because that material lies outside even the scope of any one person's mind, as no one is capable of holding in one's head all of this interactive information simply be "reading" through the physical artifact. These annotated books are, as it was said in an earlier meeting, the equivalent of "big data," and through their digitization, transcription, translation, and interpretation, we can, for the first time, mine that data and analyze any aspect of these historical sources of reading practices.

Reflections on Earlier Planning Workshop Sessions

Earle Havens: Sustainability seems always to be a pressing problem for Digital Humanities initiatives in the form of obsolescence of various kinds. How do we preserve something sustainable containing this level of scholarly engagement and functionality?

Sayed Choudhury: The Roman de la Rose Digital Library teamed with the Johns Hopkins University Press for a wider impact analysis. Efficiency improves over time and becomes a selling point, though issues of adaptability have also to be considered. Costs across the Roman de la Rose Digital Library platform involving maintenance was simply absorbed into a daily, defined budget. Outside attempts to gather revenue, such as subscription for service, also generate their own administrative costs as well. Project plans must include technological sustainability, and also ask yourself the question: "Does scholarly sustainability disappear with the end of the scholar's participation in the project?" Ultimately, we view the Roman de la Rose Digital Library as a "collection" and treat it in that way as we do any other collection in the library from this perspective. It requires resources the entire time you hold it in your institution.

Steven van Impe: Continuously growing these digital collections will help to ensure renewed interest and return on the initial and ongoing investment of resources. Commit to adding to library in manageable steps if you need to. There is a serious risk of ossification if content is not expanded and feedback is not taken and updated from time to time

Paul Saenger: How does the grant work? Will funds for regular cataloguing of these uncatalogued or undercatalogued collections need to be included, or necessary if it a sustained and updated, ongoing program?

Earle Havens: I believe the Mellon grant should primarily address intellectual needs rather than institution-specific programmatic needs over the long term with respect to sustainability.

Paul Saenger: It seems possible that symbiotic relationship between could occur between The Hidden Renaissance project and regular forms of library cataloguing. "Hidden Collections" processing grants might be another route to obtain this kind of cataloguing support.

Earle Havens: We envision this is a collection, but it is not a single "institutional collection," per

se, so there are complexities there as well.

Practicality, Fundamentals, Infrastructure: What is our hidden collection?

Stephen Ferguson: Words about describing precisely what is underway and in focus are important at this point. We are interested in the inventory/census aspect of looking at our respective collections as a whole and finding the ideal set of annotated books to work on for this project, but is this incompatible with scholarly efforts? Or are they two different activities.

Lisa Jardine: I have a strong affinity for this point, but is it to be an actual feature of the team's implementation grant proposal? Individual goals need to mesh with best practices for the humanistic academic disciplines at work in this project. It is important not to confuse focus with exclusion of all other alternatives. This project will sit in the middle of many different landscapes, not all of them can reasonably be built up into a coherent, focused, and reasonable proposal.

Earle Havens: I worked on a team dealing with about 300 significantly annotated books by President John Adams, books from his personal library, and we digitized some. Our criteria for describing annotated books were established at a much more simple level than specialized MARC cataloguing, things that even students could perform successfully. It is possible to describe the nature and breadth of annotations without going into extreme detail—an issue of scope and manageability that is always present in any such project. We envision real scholarship creating content and access, but not to the point where it might become extremely costly or prohibitive in terms of time and resources that can reasonably be brought to bear to achieve the project's more fundamental purposes and goals. It is also possible to ask whether the census/inventory idea for each institution would be a purely process issue, or one that is specifically linked to a method issue. And further, if we are talking about a fairly limited collection of deeply annotated books, say 30 or even 50, that might really only involve a relatively modest commitment of work to augment aspects of their conventional MARC records on our respective OPACs with some of the information developed for the digital application. Our institutions may all simply be able to absorb that into our own workflows as in-kind contributions to the larger project.

Anthony Grafton: These issues need to be considered together. We need the intellectual humanistic element to define and sell the program to users, but we also need it to be as useful as possible. (Re-)Cataloguing the books with much richer information garnered from the project team can also usefully reveal new methods of reading, new surprises from the books. But what does this lead to for us in terms of the larger project?

Lisa Jardine: All of this should be on the table, and distant future outcomes need not loom as important in our current discussion. Any separation of information from our project such as cataloguing issues can be done at a later date. Cataloguing, just as our interpretation of the materials, all needs to be discussed.

Stephen Ferguson: If the project were to focus on, say 12 books only, a fuller census of all our

annotated early books in our three libraries could be designed as part of the decision-making process for the next 12, for example. From that point of view, it might look more as though the core project and an institutional census are symbiotic and linked goals, rather than two separate objectives.

Andrew Pettegree: Could you develop a relatively simple vocabulary for, say, ownership annotations, versus other forms of annotation, with the community? It might be simpler for libraries to do this once a specific language is adopted. I think, for example, the conventional descriptions used to describe such things by antiquarian or used booksellers.

Johan Oosterman: Students can contribute to larger projects in this way if they have consistency and continuity across the participating organizations/countries.

Paul Saenger: Even minimal levels of cataloguing—notes and fields—present ways of tapping the wealth of material that already exists in our collections. Sometimes the thought to purchase a new book, and the culling of existing copies can lead to the discovery of existing marginalia in what you already have. This has the potential to encourage investigation within existing collections, and not just when considering the acquisition of new items that come along.

Earle Havens: It could be best to imitate scientific criteria. We have empirically evaluated our collections of early annotated books and, based on that internal process of discovery and comparison, chose diverse examples of reading practices for our project. The process could indicate to us all how the project should be laid out, where there are also natural areas for expanding our collections to fill out the fuller picture, &c.

David Kennedy: A perspective from original cataloguing may help us understand note fields, but also, MARC records can be hard (to my memory) to update.

Earle Havens: For an entire collection that may be true, but this would not necessarily involve tons of books, remember, rather a relatively modest group of items.

Sayeed Choudhury: With the Roman de la Rose Digital Library, our entire universe was already defined by the discrete number of known surviving medieval manuscript exemplars. But with the Hidden Renaissance, it seems a far more expansive set of potential candidates to digitize, transcribe, translate, &c. As a result, more deliberation will likely be necessary for the parameters and for planning. For the record, the Shared Canvas model is much easier to integrate and update than MARC records are likely to be.

Earle Havens: In the initial stages of this project, we can restrict ourselves to a conversation about the importance of some samples versus others, and discuss and ultimately explain our choices. The Bernard Rosenthal Collection at Yale can be useful by way of comparison. [Earle then discussed the specific cataloguing principles for that collection from a handout, showing how the standards developed there are useful in terms of the nature of the content and cataloguing. However, the Hidden Renaissance project is much different than that collection and its cataloguing, as we have a very specific set of texts in mind, whereas the Rosenthal Collection was created largely at random, according to what that bookseller was able to acquire in the

antiquarian book marketplace over as specific period of time, not according to content-based criteria that we would be using.

Marc Caball: Who does bibliographical, scholarly, technological work, in terms of postdocs, research assistants, in terms of the people hired on the grant, and skills would each need to possess to accomplish this work?

Stephen Ferguson: Which of the Rosenthal Collection cataloguing categories are actionable and applicable categories for this project? Think about it less as a wide range of materials. Selection and description criteria needs to be set, which is always difficult, but once they are clear and in place they are done, and even students can achieve some of the work with relatively modest skills.

Johan Oosterman: Background information on particular types of books and annotations that are often found, say, between 1500 and 1600, can be studied and described in terms of preparing the implementation proposal. Collection-level analysis could also be useful. For example determining what percentage of a collection might we expect to contain annotated Renaissance books?

Andrew Pettegree: A student summer internship program might be ideal for this sort of work in the library, but a difficult problem is finding material to keep interns busy and engaged beyond repetitive scanning, the “triage work” of separating out these annotated books and deciding which ones are important enough to note.

Sayed Choudhury: There is a forthcoming Mellon postdoctoral program specifically focusing on early modern books (versus a former concentration on medieval material). Some level of expertise may be in the offing there. In any event, consideration of your audience for your digital project needs to be at the fore in terms of what you end up doing regarding these annotated books, thinking of your end users and not just internal processes.

Lisa Jardine: Regarding the audience for CELL project, they are often younger scholars, people who are really exploring things in their work. Interns and graduate students don't mind doing the work, they often enjoy the close interaction with original sources, and often possess a useful set of skills.

Implementation: What do we need to do to get this project started?

Anthony Grafton: I think a postdoctoral fellow should be appointed at each of the three institutions, working with students intensively in the summer months, between triaging the larger annotated book holding, and larger project of transcription, translation, and interpretation. Public engagement with the types of materials being included over the course of the project and a sustained period of sifting, would present us with the ability to pull out a good result.

Lisa Jardine: We should have specific titles in place in preparing the Mellon implementation, so that we can explain to ourselves and to the Foundation precisely what we are doing. There is no reason to wait to do that initial sifting until after the grant is funded. In terms of the Hooke Folio

CELL project, we had PhD students do transcription work, overseen by a project manager: two PhDs did work on the Hooke manuscript at the same time that they were also researching and writing their dissertations. This was a good way to train, and promote and produce research from graduate students and postdoctoral fellows early on in their scholarly careers. Of course all PIs are required to put a certain percentage of their times in terms of distinct amounts of hours per week under a grant to shape the project, but postdoctoral and graduate student work is where the important stuff is really produced.

Sayed Choudhury: Is the Mellon Foundation the only source of funding for this project? Academics driven by use cases could simply involve identifying scholarly materials and working with them in other ways. Or does the collaborative institutional/foundational lens work best for this?

Paul Saenger: Other institutions/foundations would support summer interns, provide opportunities for this kind of experience for advanced undergrads

Earle Havens: Internal sources of funding, earning academic credits through directed research, etc., within our respective universities might be able to promote and support some aspects of student intern work beyond the larger implementation grant.

Lisa Jardine: We are not interested in an extremely small, easy project done on our own, we need the larger grant.

[Editorial Note: At this point, Winston Tabb intervened and asked us to direct our thoughts in practical terms to precisely what we want and need for the larger project in terms of an implementation grant. The group collectively worked on this list and came up with the following answers below. The discussion was largely driven by the PIs on the Planning Grant.]

Why are we doing this?

To understand the functionality of reading critical to our ability to interpret the historical past through textual interaction.

Because we cannot hold rich interactive annotated texts altogether in our heads at one time. To properly analyzed, indeed objectively as well as subjectively, this is why we need this electronic resource/tool.

Because these annotations are still largely inaccessible and very little known and worked on within the wider scholarly community. They can remain “hidden” from scholars and students in the form of multiple foreign languages, “hidden” simply because the manuscript notes are not easily legible, “hidden” because not cited in a descriptive way in catalogues, if at all, &c.

Humanities scholarship needs to treat texts as “big data” to be mined in electronic forms.

To allow others than the PIs to use this material and discover and come up with more than we could have imagined in their use of the functionalities and content provided.

Books constitute the primary source of what was considered by early modern scholars to be authoritative forms of knowledge. In that context, evidence of what their readers thought about them are incredibly important, especially the “professional readers” patronized by influential elites.

To provide a jumping off point for further work by younger generations of scholars.

Because we need to link texts together in ways that we will never be able to outside of the electronic realm, making connections across and between different annotated books, identifying and understanding specific relationships between texts.

Because there is a clear need for collaborative and interactive media to study collaborative and interactive historical phenomena. That needs a data model such as the one we envision.

Because books are technologies, they are interactive and dynamic as physical objects, and now we need similar interactive and dynamic technology to plumb them.

What do we want?

We want to produce a coherent series of digitized Renaissance annotated books beginning with Gabriel Harvey, and then incorporating additional materials annotated by other comparable scholarly readers (Richard Eden, Isaac Caussabon, *et al.*) from that same general time period, defined chronologically as ca. 1550 to 1650. We want to demonstrate forms/types and processes of reading through the transcription and translation of those notes in electronic forms that can be read in conjunction with digital surrogates of the original corresponding pages. We are certain that there is a ready supply of skilled graduate student research assistants and postdoctoral fellows who are already able to complete this. We would necessarily work out our conventions for editing, etc., as the project proceeds.

Sayed Choudhury: Use cases need to be written down and put out in the front.

Earle Havens: Do we need advisors appointed in a virtual capacity, if not physically present during the work, as the discussion of conventions, etc., continues.

Marc Caball: Take a broad vision for the project goals. Treated as the pilot project, it is its implementation on a case-by-case basis.

What are we doing?

[Editorial note: The six summary points below were recorded by the group over the course of the conversation that is recorded just below them.]

We are creating case-driven products; information graphs/maps to navigate from “super sets,” working with Gabriel Harvey and peer exemplars. Within this context we are:

- (1) Giving an extensive and sustained look to the intellectual process and sets of readerly of one reader, and comparing to other peer readers.
- (2) Examining in some cases different readings of the same book—put two items together read differently to determine where the book means the same thing to different readers.
- (3) Considering the arts of memory, citation, and cross-reference as other elements of reading practice.
- (4) Studying patterns of reading, sigla, marks, non-verbal “codes” indication readerly practice.
- (5) Apparent evidence of affective reactions to texts, emotion, indignation, etc.
- (6) Studying evidence of the sociability of reading (multiple hands, shared books, books apparently annotated specifically for others to read)

Anthony Grafton: Looking at annotation of printed books and trying to understand what annotations can tell us about the more fundamental nature of reading practices, their links to sociability, politics, and communities of thought. We are exploring the intellectual life, how it changes within the cultures of print and scribal annotation, specific aspects of scholarly communication. Making possible the view of how individual books were read by individual readers in the historical past.

Lisa Jardine: Until 1980, the “history of the book” existed without a distinct “history of reading.” Marginal notes and other annotations highlight the fact that books were never just inert objects. The process of specific reader engagement has a great deal of information that is still untapped, and the history of reading, by contrast to book history still a relatively new field, has accumulated only anecdotally a body of data, though in specific or isolated cases, and in ways that make the information in the annotations impossible to manage satisfactorily. The key here is for us to develop and promote electronic tools for scholars that allow for a higher, more interactive means of managing the data. We want to be able to treat the content such that we can mine it analytically, produce new interpretive data about reading, and about the period we are studying.

Andrew Pettegree: There will be a methodological objection to doing this project solely based on one person, one reader.

Lisa Jardine: I see this as 3 hubs coordinating and collaborating, that is the maximum of what we do. In our case, that just happens to take the form of materials generally coming from 3 libraries.

David Kennedy: What about the size of group? Would there be an open model for cataloguing protocols, so that our catalogue could talk to others? Does that not require a broader sample?

Lisa Jardine: While Harvey is the initial focus for this particular project, we could each identify four truly outstanding books from each of the three collections, ones that fit our general chronological and topical plan, with which to test various strategies, whether built out of the Harvey material, or out of how engagement with the variety of material in those 12 books.

Earle Havens: There are ways to start doing this survey work without a gigantic grant to enrich the proposal.

Marc Caball: Who is your typical annotating reader? There could be a problem of formulation based on using too broad a criteria regarding reading practice.

Lisa Jardine: Outputs and project innovation require planning ahead, including some relatively immediate outcomes, then some for the project as it matures, and then some directions for how the research would go. You could end up following Harvey's similar annotations across books, and actually read like he read.

Anthony Grafton: We need to be able to contextualize one reading with sources across a spectrum within reach of the annotating reader. There is no one way to read a book, but a supportable method and rationale for reading across other titles in the annotator's library would be important and useful.

Earle Havens: understanding that this is a better way to understand exemplars of candid scholarship, examples which were previously unable to be consulted. LJ - agrees - nothing fancy, just an aid to retaining and organizing data. Need ways to find it where it's repeated. Integration of existing tools into a shared and visual medium. Show, in a more accessible manner, the relationship of notes to text. AP - methodology is remarkably similar to the article that wrote

Andrew Pettegree: Can we design an electronic resource that would allow us to link multiple textual sources, including those external to the printed text, but clearly referenced in the marginal annotations? Something like partial electronic versions of a cited passage from another book that could pop up by clicking on to the reference?

Lisa Jardine: Exactly, we would hope that anyone with a collection of annotated books could use this kind of interaction.

William Sherman: I appreciate this discussion, but what do we think is revolutionary about the approach you are discussing?

Earle Havens: I think it is easy to talk about annotation, but hard to conceptualize what this will look like. By integrating these sorts of materials into this user interface, new connections can be made by the user than even we anticipate.

Lisa Jardine: Think of the Earl of Essex's rebellion in 1599, his execution for rebelling along

with Henry Cuff, the Earl's reading advisor (i.e., secretary). The marginal annotations of Livy describe how Harvey read his Livy *with* the Earl of Essex in search of legal and material justification for his plan of action.

Earle Havens: The very same thing appears in Richard Eden's annotation in Peter Martyr's *Decades* on the New World Discovery. We need to understand how Eden is mining that text to come up with arguments for the British to emulate the Spanish and build an overseas empire in the front matter of his printed 1555 English translation of Martyr.

Stephen Ferguson: That raises an interesting question, "Would annotated books that are translator's copies fit within what is envisioned?"

Anthony Grafton: Requires multiple texts available in the same place (i.e., on the same canvas), including other books in the reader's library, like a bookwheel, to cite Lisa's analogy mentioned at the beginning of our workshop. Annotations citing other texts beyond the one in the imprint also illustrates the operations of scholarly memory, as well as direct consultation of other books nearby in the same person's library, offering clues and paraphrases from the readerly practice of inspiring memories. There have been multiple "use cases" of textual annotation that have been identified since the appearance of "Studied for Action."

Stephen Ferguson: What about sigla as a use case involving sets of overlapping information.

Anthony Grafton: Recall that there are many different varieties of that practice, and it might be possible to integrate these things into something approaching a more coherent practice. We would need to consider how we identify readable, visual, non-verbal forms of annotation.

Earle Havens: What about affective elements of reading and not just rational/intellectual? Use of an elaborately drawn, large manicule? An unusually large "NOTA" in a particular set of places that seem to consistently inspire interest, the personal "excitement" of the reader?

Marc Caball: What about other emotions in the nature of reading? Anger, political outrage, &c.?

Walter Stephens: Do we have a format or method of dealing with puzzling marks (ones we don't immediately understand, short hand symbols perhaps sui generis to a particular reader)?

How are we doing this?

Winston Tabb: This needs to be done why again?

Lisa Jardine: We need to understand the functions of books and reading, and the effect of this on our lives. Think on European vs. American habits of reading in the comparative perspective.

Sayed Choudhury: Let's keep in mind the technological perspective, functions to attach all images where particular annotations exist.

Lisa Jardine: It may be more useful to have a function that isolates tabs.

Sayeed Choudhury: Like a function or event on the interface that pulls up annotations visually or a via a textual search?

Lisa Jardine: I am thinking of precise references within books.

Sayeed Choudhury: I seems like there are two goals here: (1) creating a framework that allows you to gain more insight, and (2) creating one that allows others to gain your insight.

Anthony Grafton: Books as primary sources of authority and knowledge, this is especially important for readers and/or their reading secretaries who are influential figures. Harvey is one of these, and yet this isn't necessarily possible to investigate.

Lisa Jardine: I have a framing correction to suggest: this should be a resource (i.e., a set of tools) for others to engage with the media and do further research, not simply receive the research that we provide in the interactive content.

Sayeed Choudhury: Hyperlinking texts? Hyperlinking analytics? Can you use network theory to manipulate this kind of data.

Earle Havens: Volume and frequency of citations of certain authors within a given readers annotations are important and often telling, esp. in terms of repairing to other established and possible more "authoritative" to most readers than the imprint the reader is actually annotating. We often need to use one book in order to effectively read another as readers in general, especially as scholarly readers. We need to able to create links between books along Lisa Jardine's metaphor of this interface being like a bookwheel that allows you to consult more than just the one annotated book in front of you at a given time.

Sayeed Choudhury: Information graphs can be generated as well, and might show the importance of specific kinds of frequencies identified through keyword searches, etc. In our first blog post on the Roman de la Rose Digital Library, we included video, hypertext, examples of sharing and collaboration. Caution: from my perspective in terms of the technology, I do not care whether it is Gabriel Harvey or not, but do the use cases apply to everyone else or not? How?

Lisa Jardine: Other marginalia can be thought of as small sets of Harvey. Harvey treated as superset might allow the unification of his similar, individual reading practices.

Earle Havens: We cannot forget, as well, that books are technologies as well in the early modern period, and often sophisticated ones at that. Those who envisioned the book as a surface for interactive writing may have been exceptional, but also some are more exceptional than others, and we are interested in very deeply annotated texts that will be exceptional.

William Sherman: A clarifying point: one approach could involve hyperlinking, another would be the issue looking at multiple readings of the same book (i.e., including in this digital resource multiple different annotated copies of the same original printed text, marked up by different

readers within the chronological and intellectual scope of the project).

Johan Oosterman: These tools are possible for what purpose, specifically?

Earle Havens: When your user starts working with the Shared Canvas, we do not need to anticipate and present answers to all your potential research questions at that particular time, that can emerge in response to use, perhaps?

August 31, 2013

Business Meeting IV: BLC, Richard Macksey Seminar Room, 9:00AM-12:00PM Functions, Limitations, and Wrap-up

Summary of Major Discussion Points

- An expansive list of functions was proposed for the Shared Canvas platform, in order to accommodate the scholarly and popular needs for the project. Research Maps were discussed as a possible way of facilitating and expanding data management issues.
- The Pilot Project should not extend to full census and cataloguing research among the three participating institutions, but enough should be done to demonstrate the full methodology and applicability of the database for scholarly and wider use. As such, cataloguing information must be integrated into the database.
- The project should take a team-based approach, and will rely heavily on the interaction between postdoctoral researchers at each of the three institutions, as well as their interactions with the PIs.
- The use of social media and exhibition will be important in promoting the Project to scholars across the humanities and sciences, educators, and the wider public, and in ensuring that libraries continue to acquire and scholars continue to seek out rare books for use. The group was unsure whether that use extended to full, traditional exhibitions of either rare materials or a demonstration of the database itself.

Sayeed Choudhury: Discussion of Functionalities and Interactivity Needs via Shared Canvas

[Editorial Note: The list just below was formulated by Sayeed Choudhury as he led the group in conversation about specific issues of functionality and possible interactivity, the details of that conversation appear immediately after the summary list.]

The list, below, listing core and other potential add-on functionalities, constitutes a good foundation from which a thorough technical review of currently existing and available software can be conducted, but note that they are listed in any kind of priority or hierarchical order:

- Identify same annotation across different images
- Turn “on” and “off” annotations (including those from other pages or books)
- View thumbnails of books and pages
- Browse multiple books simultaneously
- Scroll or casually flip through pages of books
- Display images from multiple books on the same screen
- Manipulate (zoom, pan, rotate, color adjust) images independently within each frame
- Capacity to layer annotations onto images
- Useful functionalities derived from forensic handwriting analysis methods
- Connect or link between different documents or different books in the collection.
- Search transcriptions and translations for keywords in original language and English translation
- Grid/percentage of progress in text. (quick aid in locating across editions of texts)
- Connect to other kinds of resources (Perseus/Hati Trust, etc) for electronic texts or images (ie. Artstor)
- Tag Annotations by subject? (Some think this may be quite work intensive, and only wise if would provide a high degree of functionality)
- Paleographical training/tutorial, cross reference to other resources (there are already available on-line resources for this)
- Life of a book through time - temporal accretion of annotations, isolate layers of annotations for different times/annotators.
- Event logging by time and by user.
- Linking to books within database
- Digitized books a functionality

William Sherman: Allan Galey (University of Toronto) developed an interface to help identify different types of handwriting. He should be contact to determine it can be incorporated into Shared Canvas element for the Implementation Grant proposal.

Lisa Jardine: The layering of texts good to see, but not as useful to work with analytically. We also may not really need some features that “look nice” like a “page turning” mechanism that is large aesthetic, but are often more trouble to design than they are worth. And we have to annotate the entire book from cover to cover, literally, not just the annotated portions

Sayed Choudhury: Pedagogical purposed tagging could be supported by electronic portfolios, software applications that let you build a record of your scholarly activity. From work with Perseus, we have learned that preservation is a concern. If we move Perseus material into the Data Conservancy for built-in preservation services, they would need to be integrated into electronic portfolios. This preserves a public/private distinction. Rights management is another difficult issue to add into a program, but if portfolios already have that, it is easier to do.

Lisa Jardine: Transcription and translation of the text are the first pedagogic tools, then comments and references (e.g. Wiki function) along with one’s own note taking.

Sayed Choudhury: Is there a desire for exhibitions of the original materials to be “curated,” that is a gallery function to illustrate reading strategies?

Lisa Jardine: How feasible would it be to put on physical exhibits at two occasions during the course of the grant? Increase interest in conservation and acquisition of titles?

Earle Havens: Such things are quite expensive and labor intensive, but not heavily attended. They are nice to do on an aesthetic level, but not necessarily for the purposes of what we are discussing which are more about interaction than physical, ephemeral display.

Anthony Grafton: An exhibit would be potentially feasible to showcase the electronic aspect of the tool, a kind of didactic exhibition, along the lines of what they often do at the Princeton Art Museum.

Paul Saenger: Electronic panels integrated with objects as a “hybrid exhibition” of panels and books could combine display of program functionalities with rare books from collections. Also the training element for users could serve as a purpose-built pedagogical tool we have been discussing. Also, would there be a limited soft launch versus a front-ended public launch? This is a user community question.

Sayed Choudhury: On the matter of preservation whatever is the digitized content, what else should be considered important to preserve? Changes in platforms as data conversion? Reading journeys? Exhibitions/gallery function paths through citations that users find? Also ORE (object reuse and exchange protocol), from evolution of the web. Expose collections from metadata, then ORE is the next step, bringing different kinds of objects into the data sets that are being worked with. Johns Hopkins’ Data Conservancy tries to connect provenance between data and publication. Eventually one goal is that individuals can create “research maps,” aggregations that assure objects are connected. This preserves figures and data that derive from them. “Resource maps” in preservation.

William Sherman: Those are things that computers can do well: different forms of analysis that are machine assisted, so what would you do with Renaissance annotations?

Sayed Choudhury: Machine-assisted research (i.e.: queries for “similar” connections/pathways enabled by resource maps). There are crude assertions about similar paths made by machines. They could be evaluated by the user and used to “teach” the program.

Anthony Grafton: What about distinguishing kinds of mapping, maps of reading across books, but also across Harvey’s notes within books (i.e., “supra” and “infra” annotations)?

Sayed Choudhury: Integration into other types of inquiries that are built into the web, along with other types of inquiries/functionalities that are required by research. Consensus: mapping technology makes larger data sets meaningful in very intuitive ways.

Lisa Jardine: About possible interference by researchers. Data end-produces different directions that researchers and scholars are not familiar with. Other use cases evolve out of the scholarly ones.

Sayeed Choudhury: Postdocs also provide a valuable link between development, scholarship, and the public.

Lisa Jardine: Need to include possibilities for interaction between technology and the public, and possibilities for the technology in the grant proposal, might usefully distinguish it from other proposals of the same sort. Technology development as a part of the humanities, and the enabling of further inquiry are vital aspects of digital humanities.

Earle Havens: I am thinking of the matter of memory in humanistic scholarship, and the various role of texts and cross-references as representing a mnemonic tradition and a different way of learning, thinking, and connecting texts.

Anthony Grafton: One can think of Ramism and graphic nature of ramified layers and categories and sub-categories of forms of knowledge. This existed clearly in Harvey's mind.

Winston Tabb: I suggest that a list of tasks be disseminated for prioritization for the final implementation grant proposal, at the start of the writing of that grant with time to report back and discuss.

[Editorial Note: Feasibility discussions ended here. Then began a recap on the earlier discussion on census taking at the three libraries and the issue of conventional catalogue records for the books to be digitized. It was agreed that there was a high priority given to cataloguing information being integrated in some way into the platform. Census work not as high a priority early on, and may not be an essential component of this project proposal at the implementation phase].

Earle Havens: We have outcome in mind here, but I would suggest that institutional census-taking of their respective annotated books that fall within our defined scope and period, is more a process-related question.

Lisa Jardine: It might be possible to make a trial census among three institutions.

Earle Havens: This might be more of a fact-finding approach, than an essential activity. What of the collection that we come up with will really be usable to us, and worth the effort, time, and resources?

Paul Saenger: Some items you uncover in your collections might have later uses, or use to a different set of scholars. I think, for example, of the discovery of early and important Hebrew fragments found as waste in bindings.

Sayeed Choudhury: Statistics of use from Roman de la Rose Digital Library. 87,000 visits from users in 181 countries, including 57,000 unique visitors, 35% recurring visitors. You will want and need good reach and depth statistics like this.

Lisa Jardine: The project title, "Hidden Renaissance." This presents problem for Europe, generally speaking for most scholars "Renaissance" usually ends ca. 1550. Also, the word

“hidden” is quite generic. What about terms like “recovering” and “marginalia”?

Earle Havens: What about more energetic terms that imply real action, plunging into the materials, archaeological terms like “excavating”? What does someone who assesses grant titles think?

[Editorial Note: In the days immediately following the Planning Workshop, the PIs settled on a new title for the Implementation Grant Proposal, calling the project the “Archaeology of Reading.”]

What do we need institutionally to make this happen? What resources do we already have

Singleton Center for the Study of Premodern Europe at Johns Hopkins, wishes to co-sponsor the grant and will supply modest funding to support graduate participation, possible conferences addressing the project, panels at academic conference where the Center can sponsor institutionally.

Similar support can be given by the Humanities Council at Princeton.

Winston Tabb: We should develop and circulate a meeting report and, subsequent to that, a draft report for review by all participants well before the March 31, 2014 Planning Workshop grant deadline. Earle will work with Lisa Jardine and Tony Grafton on this later this year as we get close to closing the project.

Earle Havens: Are we agreed that postdoctoral fellowships at our respective institutions the answer to what we mainly need? Graduate student research assistants?

Lisa Jardine: I would prefer to designate that what we want are project staff who are “early career researchers” with a doctoral qualification rather than strictly or exclusively postdoctoral fellows, as dictated by the materials to be worked. At least one person should also combine some information technology literacy (beyond basic computer literacy) a prerequisite, as well as more general paleographic and area-specific skills to do the humanistic work. That precise language can be captured in a job posting.

Earle Havens: Yes, but to budget the project, we need to have a sense of the conventional amounts paid at each institution for different levels of work, whether that of a current graduate student working on a PhD, a researcher with a PhD, etc.

Andrew Pettegree: Is the skill set of the 3 postdocs to be identical. Varied skillsets are needed in continental European work, Germanic material is a large set of potential research material, Italian, French, etc.

Anthony Grafton: I have seen considerable skills variance among postdoctoral fellows across American universities.

Earle Havens: Skill set of the individual postdoctoral fellows and graduate student researchers should be based upon requirements for digitization at each institution. A sound proficiency in paleography and Latin will of course be essential.

Marc Caball: The team-based approach outlined here may need to involve more scholarly and active independence granted to the project staff, beyond the basic performance of a basic task under close supervision. This can be cited as a qualification as well. This project's team approach can help overcome the traditional solitary nature of humanities research.

Andrew Pettegree: Tasks need not be confined to the particular university where researcher is based, especially when dealing with and working from digitized surrogates.

Anthony Grafton: It is absolutely essential that at least 20% of the workweek of any postdoctoral fellow must be set aside for his/her own work, so as to keep current in one's field while thinking ahead to permanent employment. What mix do we want? At Princeton and JHU, do we want solidly historical/philological/paleographical, one on the balance with an emphasis on information technology?

Earle Havens: There should also be some form of faculty appointment and affiliation within the department in which the postdoctoral fellow holds his/her degree, and teaching possibilities much also be determined. We may need some people outside the English-language tradition, depending on the material to be worked on. Core requirements should be identified first as the budget will add up quickly, but university community involvement can come from, as well, from add-ons to the grant (grad and undergrad research, internal institutional funding, &c.)

Anthony Grafton: Andrew Pettegree has a good concern about the sources of funding and their dependence on individual sources. Do we also need another funding resource outside of Mellon?

Andrew Pettegree: Role and cost of PIs needs to be incorporated into the Mellon, an advantage over other grants.

Lisa Jardine: Is there ever a minimum time commitment that PIs must give.

Sayed Choudhury: I think it is something like at least one full month's time out of a year, we need to check.

Andrew Pettegree: How do the roles of PIs differentiate from the larger enterprise of the advisors here. Built-in time for PIs can be accompanied by salary replacement, in some cases salary support, not in Britain, but here in the United States you usually have to tell them what you get paid and work out the percentage. Buyouts from teaching responsibilities, summer salary replacement where applicable, &c.

Sayed Choudhury: Mellon's reporting requirements are quite clear and strict, and reporting requirements can take up a significant amount of time, one reason to argue for at least a part time, experienced digital humanities Project Manager or Coordinator in the proposal to keep everything moving at the right time and on the right schedule. Technically, PI contributions

could eat up a large portion of the available grant money. Mellon interested only for the purpose of the grant.

Anthony Grafton: Like a Manager in Princeton's History Department, funding a portion of an individual's time.

Promotion and Communication

Public presentations, by project people from technology end at various Digital Humanities conferences and related meetings.

Which organizations to target: Renaissance Society of America, American Historical Association as part of the digital track, the Coalition for Networked Information, Digital Library Federation project briefings, JSK(?), European Association for Digital Humanities, European Library Automation Group.

Stand alone conferences at the three participating institutions, or a day-long workshop attached to a larger annual related conferences with several panels on this project built on specific "history of the book" themes, such as the annual summer St. Andrews Book Conference, those of the Society for the History of Authorship, Reading, and Printing, and/or of the Rare Book and Manuscript Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries

Other methods: Blog, Social Media, Small videos on Youtube, TED Talks, Chronicle of Higher Education write up.

There is also the possibility of promoting this project in sciences as well.

Also obviously through scholarly journal publications in the various related aspects and quarters where this project would be complimentary.

Closing Comments

Walter Stephens: This could be an ideal tool to help us carry this into what we as educators do in the classroom, especially with a tiered structure of university, and beyond university, involvement.

Steven van Impe: The structure in project, seems ideal as a pilot project, though I think the idea of a census of your respective collections of relevant annotated early modern books at your three universities is also very important, as well as a method of standardization in terms of how you describe the attributes of the books.

Johan Oosterman: Dissemination is very important, we need better coordination between digital humanities, scholars, and the use of these actual materials. This project is not only on several separate annotators, but holds much greater ambition in playing a pivotal role in historical

research on reading practice.

Matthew Symonds: We should now focus on the practicalities at hand in the grant process. This has been an inspiring and exciting couple of days.

Lisa Jardine: Thanks all around.

Anthony Grafton: Focus is critical moving forward as the larger project gets shaped.

Andrew Pettegree: Effective circulation is important, but also the number of projects that are relatively unknown to me in the Digital Humanities is alarming. Publicity is so important, and do not ignore print as a mechanism for spreading word about the project. And you must pay attention to sustainability throughout. Britain's Art and Humanities Research Council is simply littered with defunct databases that had been funded in previous years.

Marc Caball: I just want to emphasize the human element. In Lisa Jardine, Anthony Grafton, and Earle Haves we have inspirational scholars at work on this evolving body of scholarship, and I fully expect that to be reflected in the final project.

Earle Havens: Thanks to you all. We will follow up before the reporting deadline on this Planning Workshop with a transcript, an evaluation form, and a final solicitation for input later in the year, as we approach the Spring application process for the implementation grant. I have forms for you to complete and sense with receipts for reimbursement, one for domestic travelers another for those of you coming to us from outside the United States. Thanks again, this was fascinating and gave us all much to think about in the coming months, as the PIs follow up with one another and confer.

APPENDIX

Use Cases Approach to Digital Software Development

The Digital Research and Curation Center at the Sheridan Libraries has adopted a specific approach in software development though specific "use cases."

After the need for a particular functionality is identified, we approach use cases by looking at a needed functionality from a user perspective. Use case development does not include the identification of the need, but rather an articulation of how the functionality should work.

At a high level of analysis, we consider the following with respect to use cases:

What prompts or provokes the user (or machine) to initiate this functionality?

What conditions need to exist to allow the function to be initiated and completed successfully?

What are the normal steps taken to initiate and complete the function?

What should happen if things don't go as expected in a given step or set of steps?

What conditions should exist when the function is completed?

The answers to these questions are then articulated from (again) the user perspective—not from the perspective of the system or the developer. As such, use cases should also not contain implementation details.